

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 and 11 were amended in this response. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendment. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, on page 6, lines 19-29 of the present specification.

Claims 1-7 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Leppinen* (US Patent 6,735,186). Claims 8, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Leppinen* (US Patent 6,735,186) in view of *Lee* (US Patent 6,609,150) were rejected under. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The cited art, alone or in combination, does not disclose “establishing and maintaining a second session in the IP network in parallel with the first session and a restricted user interface, wherein the restricted user interface is a mobile radio terminal” and “enabling control of the first and second session via the mobile radio terminal, wherein the mobile terminal has access to the unrestricted user interface” as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 11 (“wherein the mobile radio terminal has access to the computer screen during interaction between the first and second session”). The present claims recite a method and arrangement wherein the control of the interacting first session and second session is realized via the first terminal (mobile radio terminal), whereby the user has access (i.e., visually observes) the screen of the second terminal (computer). In other words, the outputs with respect to the user occur visually via the screen of the computer while the control of the two interacting sessions is realized by the user via the mobile radio terminal.

In contrast, *Leppinen* only teaches a single mobile radio terminal (mobile station 12) that can be accessed by the user, where the other computers (web server 14 and gateway server 16) cannot be directly accessed by the user of the mobile station 12 and which do not have a screen which can be seen by the user of the mobile station 12. Under *Leppinen*, the user of the mobile station 12 can only see the display unit of the mobile station 12 (i.e., the restricted user interface).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is improper and should be withdrawn. Furthermore, as *Lee* does not solve the deficiencies of *Leppinen*, discussed above, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 must also fall.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. As such, claims 1-13 of the present application are patentable over the art of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Peter Zura  
Reg. No. 48,196  
Customer No.: 29177  
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: November 9, 2005